

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendment to Claims

In response to the Office action, claims 7 and 15 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Applicant maintains that no new matter has been introduced.

I. §103 Rejection

The Office withdrew the previous rejection against claims 7-11 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nagasaka et al. (US 5974218). The Office now rejects claims 7-11, 2-3, 12-13 and 15-16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasaka and further in view of Akiba et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Examiner is misinterpreting the claims. The claims recite that providing a memory by using an index to store different addresses of the memory for each of a plurality of sequential frames of the data recorded; retrieving at least a portion of the data by accessing the memory addresses from the index; looping the data on the memory by overwriting a portion of the memory; and providing a loop remnant directory to determine a changing boundary between newly ones of the frames. None of the prior art teaches, suggests, or motivates one of ordinary skill in the art provide a loop remnant directory to determine a changing boundary between newly ones of the frames.

Again, while Nagasaka discloses a method for creating a storage structure where frames can be detected, it fails to disclose all the recited elements. With respect to claim 7, the critical element missing in Nagasaka is looping the data on the memory by overwriting a portion of the memory.

As for Akiba, it does not disclose looping the data on the memory by overwriting a portion of the memory and a loop remnant directory to determine a changing boundary between newly ones of the frames. While it discloses a ring buffer, as it records, the content of the frame buffer No. 1 is replaced with the video data read out from to display the next. (See col. 18, lines 10-15). As the frame buffers are changed, the index is changed. Akiba does not provide a loop remnant directory to determine a changing boundary between newly ones of the frames.

Also, Applicant emphasized that even if Akiba recited all the elements of the pending claims, the rejections on obviousness would still be inappropriate because one of ordinary skill in


the art would have expected the claimed combinations to fail. The reason is that such a person would have expected such combination to fail: (1) using an index to store different addresses of the memory for each of a plurality of sequential frames of the data recorded (2) looping the data on the memory by overwriting a portion of the memory and (3) loop remnant directory to determine a changing boundary between newly ones of the frames. The proof is that Akiba is disclosing an index buffer and a frame buffer in which the buffers are a just temporary storage location for data information being sent or received and the index is not to store different address of sequential frames of the data recorded, there is no mention of a loop remnant directory to determine a changing boundary between newly ones of the frames. Thus, the Office further fails to provide sufficient motivation to combine the cited references.

Request For Allowance

Claims 3-4, 7-13, 15 and 16 are pending in this application. The applicant requests allowance of all pending claims.

June 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



Mei Tsang, Reg. No. 56,122

Fish & Associates, PC
2603 Main Street, Suite 1050
Irvine, CA 92614-6232
tel: 949-253-0944
fax: 949-253-9069